



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἡ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἀνὰ ἡμετέρας, ἀγῶν ῥιόδωρος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁσίου ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ναυαγίου.

LXXXII. 14.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. II.—No. 14.

FEBRUARY, 1853.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Florence Confessors—Rosa Madiai	13
On the Celibacy of the Clergy—A Dialogue between two Italian Gentlemen	13
The Mortmain Committee—Metairie v. Wiseman	15
The Talk of the Road—No. IX.	16
The Baptism of a Bell	16
The Rule of Faith (continued)—Part IV.	17
Civil and Religious Liberty—Pope Pius IX. and the Republic of New Grenada	19
The Touchstone (continued)	20
CORRESPONDENCE:	
On Image Worship, by Sidrach	21
On the Touchstone, by Catholicus	22
On what is the Church founded, according to the Council of Trent? by Fontium Petitor	22
On Hades, by A Novice	23
Notes and Queries	23
Farming Operations for February	23

THE CONFESSORS OF FLORENCE.

IN the nineteenth century of the Christian era, in the year of our Lord, 1851, Francesco Madiari and his wife were arrested in Florence, on the charge that they having themselves apostatized from the Catholic religion and professed an heretical confession, called evangelical, were also guilty of impiety in seeking by the distribution of tracts, and by other similar means, to propagate the same opinions amongst others; and it was upon this latter charge of proselytism that the public prosecutor relied as bringing them within the criminal code of Tuscany. On this charge they were arrested. Pending the trial both were shut up in prison. After nine months' imprisonment the trial came on. At the trial, the Madiari admitted the truth of some of the charges brought against them. They confessed that they did accord more authority to the Bible than to the Church of Rome; that they had sought to instruct others in those truths of the Gospel which had brought comfort to their own souls; and, finally, that they had held meetings at their own house, for purposes of prayer and examination of Scripture.

The court, in its sentence of condemnation, resting on the proofs and admission of such meetings having been held, particularly on one stated to have been held on the 17th August, 1851, at which three persons, a child of 15 years, and the Madiari, were surprised in the house of the latter, reading the Bible translated by Diodati, each one having a copy under his eye, and further alleging that tracts had been distributed by the Madiari at various times, then proceeded to condemn the husband to upwards of four years' seclusion in the prison of the Volterra, and the wife to nearly four years' imprisonment in the prison at Lucca. Those punishments they are now undergoing.

In the first century of the Christian era a certain Jew, of the name of Paul, traversed the whole circuit of the Roman Empire, preaching, throughout all its cities, that the gods whom the people worshipped, and whose worship was established by law, were no gods, but wood and stone; endeavouring to persuade all who would listen to him to apostatize from that religion in which they had been brought up, holding, even at Rome, and when under the guard of soldiers, meetings at his own lodgings, at which he "expounded and testified of the kingdom of God, persuading those who came to him concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and the prophets." This course he pursued for a number of years, accused by the Jews "as a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews, and a ringleader of the sect of the Christians." He confessed openly "that after the way they called heresy so worshipped he the God of his fathers, believing all things which were written in the law and the prophets." Dragged before the tribunal of the Roman governors upon those charges, even Festus, the corrupt procurator, could find no fault in all these things, and would have discharged him ultimately, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar.

What crime have the Madiari committed that Paul was not guilty of?

We confess we are unwilling to treat this remarkable case on the narrow grounds of comparison between the tolerant principles professed by the reformed Churches and the intolerant ones sanctioned by the Church of Rome. The issue in question is a wider one. Are the Madiari Christians or not? Are they, according to the evidence afforded to us, believers in those doctrines for the truth of which Stephen, and Paul, and Peter, and James laid down their lives, and suffered all things that they might win Christ? If they are Christians, what, then, are their persecutors, and with whom ought all who profess Christianity to sympathize and unite?

Is an undoubting trust and faith in Christ as a Saviour, a firm reliance on his mediation, a test of Christianity? Listen, then, to Rosa Madiari, writing to her husband—"Courage, dearest. The Holy Spirit has enabled us to bear witness that this Christ, laden with opprobrium and trampled under foot, is our King and our Saviour, and we, through the effect of his light and his power, have taken up the defence of the cross of Christ, bearing his shame, in order that we may one day share in his holiness and glory." Is submission to the will of God in all our trials, meekness and long-suffering under oppression and wrong, evidence of a desire to imitate the example of him who, in his last agony in the garden, prayed—"Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will but as thou wilt?" Hear the same Rosa Madiari—"We have been cast down but not conquered, and I hope that, through the merits of Christ, the Father has accepted our witness, and will enable us to drink, even to the last drop, the portion of that bitter cup which he has prepared for us, and to drink it with thanksgiving." Words not used in the day of prosperity and when troubles are but prospective, but proceeding from one already experiencing the bitterness of the loss of all worldly happiness.

Do we reckon it a proof of the faith of Peter and the other apostles that, when beaten with scourges, they went on their way, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Christ? In the same spirit can Rosa Madiari write to her husband—"Be not afraid: God, who made the chains of St. Peter to fall off, and open to him the gates of the prison, will certainly not forget us. Be of good courage, and let us commit ourselves entirely into the hands of God. Bear up, so that I shall behold you joyous, as I hope you will see the effects of the same grace in me." Does Christ himself promise that "every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sister, or fathers, or mothers, or wife, or children, for his name's sake, shall inherit everlasting life?" Who shall exclude from that glorious promise her who, in writing to her husband, says—"Thou knowest if I have loved thee, but how much more now that we have together fought for the great king," and who, notwithstanding that love, has submitted to separation and imprisonment—to the tedium of prolonged confinement—to the hardship of prison discipline.

Remember that the past lives of these persons have been in conformity with these sentiments. Against them even the unscrupulous malignity of their enemies has raised no charge of moral delinquency, even the public prosecutor in his speech declared—"That the acts of goodness, natural probity and benevolence, that were urged on behalf of Madame Madiari in arrest of judgment, might cause one to grieve more over her separation from Catholicism, but could not free her from the present accusation."

We ask, then, our readers, do they believe the Madiari to be Christians or not? Try it by another test. Suppose the trial and imprisonment of the Madiari had taken place in Constantinople, and not in Florence; the Grand Seigneur the sovereign, and not the Grand Duke; the Mahometan Muftis the accusers, and not the Romish priests; the charges brought forward the same as those made against the Madiari; the evidence of Christian principle and Christian practice such as we have stated. What view would Christian Europe take of the persecution? Would we stop to inquire whether the victims of the Mahometan persecution acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope or not? Would we ask in

what Church baptized? And if the Madiari, on the facts before us, would be martyrs at Constantinople, what are they at Florence? If the charges on which they are found guilty are worthy of punishment, how can Rome herself justify her missions to the heathen nations? If their condemnation be just, then the condemnation of Christ by the Jews is worthy of all commendation. He denounced the consecrated priesthood of Aaron as blind leaders of the blind; he declared that by their traditions they made the Word of God of none effect. They built the tombs of the prophets, and in so doing condemned the conduct of their fathers who persecuted the prophets; yet they imitated the example of their fathers, and slew him of whom the prophets spake. And may not the same be said now of the Church of Rome? She appeals to Peter and Paul, and the other Apostles, as the founders of her spiritual authority, and yet exceeds heathen Rome in the severity of her persecution of those against whom no charge can be brought, save such as was brought against them. Let us not forget that the strength which has enabled this poor Italian courier and his wife to resist the authority of an unjust sentence, and to suffer under the rigour of persecution, is the same which, eighteen centuries ago, founded our Church, and, three centuries ago, reformed it, and in each case changed the face of the world.

Nor is this warning to ourselves without its necessity. There is not a single member of the reformed Churches, here or abroad, who, if he acts up to his profession, would not be bound to do as the Madiari have done. If the Madiari are justly condemned, we, too, are obnoxious to the same condemnation. The power may be wanting at present for its active operation. Are we sure that the will is absent?

An appeal has been made, by an eminent nobleman in England, the Earl of Carlisle, to the Roman Catholic citizens of this empire, "to address the voice of remonstrance to their spiritual superiors, to rescue them from the intolerable reproach this persecution must bring upon them." To that appeal a Roman Catholic gentleman, the late member for Youghal, Mr. Chisholm Anstey, has replied that that appeal is useless. He tells us that nearly every member of the Roman Catholic body is persuaded that it is the bounden duty of the State to coerce heretics by temporal penalties, and, if need be, to extirpate them by the sword.

Again we ask our Roman Catholic readers, is this so or not? Do they sympathize with the Madiari or with their persecutors? If with the latter, what is the nature of that religion which condemns to imprisonment and death those who, in their life and in their trials, exhibit the same Christian patience, the same earnest spirit, the same unwearied trust that, in the first ages of the Christian Church, overturned the idolatrous worship of heathen Rome, and extended the sway of Christian doctrine and Christian knowledge to the furthest limits of the world?

We regret that want of space prevents us from reprinting the letters of the Earl of Carlisle and Mr. Anstey, which well deserve to be recorded.

DIALOGUE ON THE CONSTRAINED CELIBACY IN THE CHURCH OF ROME, BETWEEN TWO ITALIAN GENTLEMEN.

Salviano—True, dear friend, I have married a wife, and I have not done so without good reason. Matrimony is the fountain of the human race, the seed-plot of the Church, a balm for our cares, a comfort in our afflictions, and the object of Divine blessings. God himself instituted it after the creation of the world: Increase and multiply, said God to our first parents, and replenish the earth. Nay, marriage is, to true Christians, the type of a very great mystery—namely, the intimate union of Christ and his Church.

Eustachio—And I tell you that you have done wrong to enter into this state; nor do I say so without very good reason. Marriage is, in fact, without contradiction, a carnal state; contrary to one who desires to be perfect, and very unsuitable to one who wishes to serve God. Moreover, it is filthiness in clergymen, a crime in priests, impurity in saints. He who is in the married state is in the flesh, and he that is in the flesh cannot please God.

Salviano—Oh, this is fine talk! You, Romanists, are certainly extraordinary people: at one time you say that marriage is a sacrament, at another you call it filthiness. Truly, I know not how you reconcile these opinions—that marriage is a sacrament of the Church, and that it is filthiness for the men of the Church; that it is a sacrament for the laity, and a sacrilege for the priests. You say that all the sacraments of the Church are holy. How, then, can marriage, which is a holy thing, defile those who aspire to holiness? Dear friend, you wish to be a good Catholic, and yet you put forward the arguments of heretics condemned by your own Church. You maintain, in fact, with the heretics of former times, that to be in the flesh means to be married; and we, with St. Clement, of Alexandria, reply to you that St. Paul says also to the married—“Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit.” The married, if they are regenerate, are not in the flesh; therefore, being in the flesh does not at all mean living in the married state. The expressions, to walk according to the flesh, to be in the flesh, to do the work of the flesh, do not mean, according to St. Paul, to have a wife and children; but they do mean to have a corrupt nature and to bring forth sin. Did you ever read that the Apostles, when they forbid the works of the flesh, forbid marriage? St. Paul gives us a very long list of the works of the flesh, amongst which you certainly will not find marriage; but you will find adultery, fornication, and uncleanness. Marriage comes from God and cannot make those that are married displeasing in his sight. According to your opinion, the patriarchs were in the flesh, the priests could not serve God, the prophets were profane, because some of all these were married. Therefore, Enoch, though he had the privilege of being exempted from death, did not please God; nor did Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness; nor Abraham, the father of the faithful; nor Moses, the giver of the law; nor Samuel, a Nazarite of God; nor Ezekiel, a prophet of the Most High. In short, according to your opinion, all married persons go to hell, since you maintain that those who are married live in the flesh, and he who lives in the flesh is condemned. Listen to the words of St. Paul—“If ye live after the flesh ye shall die,” and you know well that here the Apostle speaks of eternal death. In the Old Testament marriage was consistent with the sacred office; so that the priests who performed the holy rites took wives; even the high priest, though he alone was permitted to enter the holy of holies, might marry a wife, provided she was not a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor profane, nor an harlot; but he was to take a virgin of his own people to wife.—Levit. xxi. 12. If marriage was permitted to the priests of the synagogue, I know not why it should be forbidden to the ministers of the Church.

Eustachio—Do you, then, think that whatever was permitted to the priests of the Old Testament is suitable to those of the New?

Salviano—Why not? If matrimony were a carnal state how would God have permitted it to those ministers to whom was prescribed a special purity of body; to those who were defiled by only touching a dead body; to those ministers who were obliged to purify themselves so frequently with water, that they might not be unclean? Let us speak seriously. You say that that is not lawful now to ministers which was formerly lawful to the priests. If so, you are bound, undoubtedly, to prove that Jesus Christ has repealed that ancient law, and enacted a new one in its stead. Come, then. How do you prove that marriage is forbidden to the pastors of the Church of God? On the contrary, according to the teaching of St. Paul—“A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour,” &c. “One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God? Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued. Not given to much wine. Not greedy of filthy lucre. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers; sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.”—1 Timothy iii. 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12. The rules given by you to the clergy are opposed to these ordinances, given by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus.

Eustachio—That he should be husband of one wife means that he should be clergyman of one parish—bishop of only one bishopric.

Salviano—Truly this is a bold assertion! In this manner you wish to allegorize and get rid of the force of so convincing an argument; but consider that your allegory is opposed to the text, in which, if you look into it closely you will see that St. Paul distinguishes between the wife of the bishop and the Church. He speaks of the children of the bishop, distinguishing them from spiritual children. He speaks of the household of the bishop, distinguishing it clearly from the household of God. Do not you see that the Apostle argues from the less to the greater, and that this is his meaning? If the bishop does not know how to rule his own house, how shall he be fit to rule the Church of God? If he has not the qualities fitting him to govern his own wife, his own children, his own household, how shall he be capable of ruling well the Church of Christ

and its ministers? It is true that St. Paul does not oblige every priest to marry; but he orders him to do so if he cannot contain, and to have but one wife, and not more at the same time, as the Jews used to do. It is in this way that we understand him; and if you Romanists were candid, you, too, would be obliged to take the same meaning from his words.

Eustachio—When the Apostle says that he should be the husband of one wife he means it of the past, and not of the present. Besides which, the law of St. Paul was only for the rising Church, in which it would have been difficult to find bishops, if married men had not been admitted to the bishopric.

Salviano—Are you joking, or are you in earnest? How can St. Paul mean it of the past, if he says it of the present? He must be the husband of one wife. If to be the husband of one wife mean to have been the husband of one wife, then to be blameless will also mean to have been blameless—to be sober will mean to have been sober. Do you think it, then, enough for a shepherd of souls to have been blameless—to have been sober—to have been vigilant, although he be none of these at present? Tell me, do you understand of the past also what St. Paul says of the wives of the deacons, that they must be grave, not false accusers, sober, faithful in all things? If you understand this, also, of the past, you must affirm that he was giving instructions for the wives whom the deacons had had, but who were then either divorced or dead. Our sun, my friend, shines brightly, and in vain do you try to cloud it over. And why say that the law of St. Paul was only given for a time? How do you prove that God gave another law afterwards? Every profane person might in this manner cast aside all the precepts of God. No, no—St. Paul does not mean it of the past. I might confound you by bringing up a host of expositors, from among those whom the Church of Rome venerates as saints: for instance, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and others who have never dreamed that the Apostle, in speaking of the wives of the bishops, meant to speak of the past; but what would be the use of this, when the text of St. Paul is so plain in itself?

Eustachio—Have you anything else to bring forward from your St. Paul?

Salviano—Yes, St. Paul is mine; and if he were among you on the earth he would run the risk of being excommunicated by you for having proclaimed the ordinances of God, and maintained them against those of your Church. Yes, this St. Paul is ours, and it is he who says—“To avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband”—1 Cor. vii. 2. When St. Paul says *every man, every woman*, surely he does not except the bishops, the priests, the monks, or the nuns. No, marriage is honourable in all—in bishops, friars, and nuns, as well as in the laity.

Eustachio—Now I have caught you. Here St. Paul is not yours, indeed. These words, in all, are not by any means to be understood of all persons; in fact, if they were to be understood so, marriage would be lawful between father and daughter, or between brother and sister. No, sir, the sacred text means marriage is honourable in all things, and not in all persons; and here St. Paul is not on your side, or, at least, he is not certainly against us.

Salviano—The words, in all, are perfectly clear in the Greek text (*ἐν παντί*), and you deceive yourself when you say that the word all does not indicate persons but things: as if St. Paul had said marriage is honourable in all things; but it is clear as the daylight that the word “all” is put in opposition to fornicators and adulterers; and on account of this contrast it cannot point out any other than persons who marry, that they may not live in such sin. The true sense, then, of this great declaration is, that marriage is honourable in all who, according to nature and the Divine law, may be joined together: whether they be ecclesiastics or secular persons it matters not. The marriage of a father with his daughter, of a brother with his sister, is incestuous, and nature and the law condemn such unions, whence they are not understood by St. Paul in the word all. Nature, therefore, and the Divine law, on the one hand, oblige your clergy who cannot contain to marry. You, on the other hand, forbid them to do so. And do not you perceive that this is the character of those teachers who “In the last times shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry?” &c.—1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3. I know well that there are some among you who apply these prophecies to our reformers; but with what appearance of truth? With what conscience do you do this? Which of them forbid marriage? But your doctrines are so far from being taught by Christian reformers, that they are always condemned by them.

Eustachio—I think that in this case both sides are in error; our people wrong yours if they make this application of the text. Your people, on the other hand, wrong ours by saying that St. Paul spoke in this prophecy of those who forbid the clergy to marry. In fact, we do not forbid marriage; we only say that those who do not wish or cannot remain without wives should not

be made priests. St. Paul, in this passage, foretells the heresy of the Tacians, the Marcionites, and the Manicheans, who condemned marriage as a thing evil in itself and proceeding from the devil.

Salviano—So you do not forbid marriage! then why do you speak of it as a carnal state? Why do you call it uncleanness? Why, in defence of this your new law, do you fight with the weapons of the heretics of other times? You do not wish to be either Tacians or Manicheans, yet you bring against us the stale arguments adopted by them against your Church. We shall see from it in what manner your people forbid marriage. I shall now only observe, that you argue badly in saying St. Paul speaks of these heretics, therefore he does not speak of us, as if this special application must hinder a more general one. The Apostle points out not only the above-mentioned heretics who condemned marriage as a thing evil in itself, but also those who considered it contrary to the state of perfection, as you yourselves do. I will tell you two things to which, if you will attend, I think you will change your opinion. The first is, that the Apostle, having said, in the foregoing chapter, that the bishop should be the husband of one wife, comes now to speak of the teachers who broach a doctrine contrary to his, and plainly points out those who forbid bishops and other ecclesiastics to marry, tolerating in them base and evil habits rather than grant to them liberty to live in the holy state of matrimony. The second is, that St. Paul speaks of the teachers of the last times—“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith.” These last times are not the whole period of the New Testament dispensation. The Apostle distinguishes them clearly and expressly from those in which he lived—in a word, these latter times, according to Anselm, Liranus, and Bellarmine are the times of Antichrist. Now, according to you, Antichrist was not in the time of the Tacians, the Marcionites, and the Manicheans: how, then, can the Apostle speak precisely of these? It is evident, therefore, that these false teachers, foreseen by St. Paul, were to arise afterwards—that is, in after times of the last days.

Eustachio—But you maintain that he who has not the gift of continency is indispensably obliged to marry. Is there, then, no other remedy? May not he who does not possess this gift obtain it from God by tears and prayers? Does not our good Father grant us whatever we ask him in the name of his only begotten Son? I think that he that is obliged, by a solemn vow, not to marry, may, by fastings and penances, quench his evil desires.

Salviano—All have not the gift of continency. “I would that all men were even as myself,” says St. Paul, “but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner and another after that.”—1 Cor. vii. 7. The Apostle does not command that he who has not the gift of continency should ask it of God, or procure it to himself, by fastings or by penances; it does not even come into his mind to give to the incontinent the counsels given by the Roman councillors or lawgivers; on the contrary, he says—“If they cannot contain let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn.” Our Heavenly Father does give us whatsoever we ask him in the name of his blessed Son; but this must be understood of the things necessary to salvation. Now, if it is necessary to salvation not to marry it follows that all married people are to be damned. We deceive ourselves if we presume to obtain by discipline that which St. Jerome did not obtain; we may read, however, how he grieves about this in an epistle to Eusebius. He, therefore, who macerating himself with discipline, still feels the lust of the flesh, is called to the holy state of matrimony; and if he does not obey this call, he rebels against God and against nature. Continency is rare. Read what Gregory the Great says of it—“De Cura Pastorium,” third part, 30th chapter. In short, no one can bind himself by vow to a thing which is in the power of another. He who makes a vow to be always continent, with chastity of body and mind, resembles one who should make a vow always to be in his right senses.

Eustachio—I wish to know from you if the apostles had wives.

Salviano—Certainly; some of them had, and they had them when they were called to the apostleship, and even while they were exercising the apostolic functions. St. Peter had a mother-in-law, and, consequently, a wife.—Matt. viii. 14. St. Ambrose says that all the apostles, except St. John, were married, and, according to St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Peter had children. Philip the Evangelist had four daughters that prophesied. It is said that St. Luke lived eighty-four years in the married state; and St. Peter, according to your legend, had a daughter called Petronilla. Were the apostles then in the flesh? were they also displeasing to God?

Eustachio—Some apostles, it is true, had wives when they were called to the apostleship; but then they left their houses, and possessions, and wives to follow Christ. This is a truth which you cannot deny, whilst it is so evident in the Scriptures. James and John left their father to follow Jesus when he called them. “We,” said St. Peter, “have forsaken all and followed thee.”—Matt. xix. 27. It is true that he had a daughter,

Petronilla; but that happened before he was called to the apostleship.

Salviano—Oh, how you deceive yourself, my friend; you think that the apostles left their wives for ever! If we are to believe the fabulous accounts, either tacitly or expressly approved by your Church, the person married at the marriage of Cana was St. John the Evangelist. Do you think that this man, having seen the miracle that Jesus wrought under those circumstances, left his wife entirely, and for ever, to follow the Redeemer? Did Jesus Christ come to separate on earth those whom his Father had joined together in heaven? Did he come to upset the ordinances of God and of nature, to break the closest of all unions, to induce the husband to violate his matrimonial pledge? Oh, no. On the contrary, the divine Redeemer, by his most holy doctrine, abrogated the ancient law, or, rather, the corrupt custom of the Jews, declaring to their face that it was not lawful for them to put away their wives except for adultery. Now, according to your opinion, the practice of Jesus differed from his theory, if he obliged his disciples to forsake their wives; but if he had done so, what would not his inveterate enemies, who were the close observers of all his doings, have said of him who denies that, when necessity demands it, we ought to give up everything, even life itself? Justice demands that we should leave the earth for him who, for our sakes, came down from heaven. Parents, wives, possessions are to be forsaken when they stand in the way of our salvation—when these transitory things may prove an obstacle to the pursuit of eternal things; but you consider those to be angels on earth who, having left their wives without necessity, devote themselves to the monastic life. I say, without necessity, because a believer may be saved without being a monk. You say that a young girl gains much merit who, having forsaken her parents, takes refuge in a nunnery. The monastic life is a human invention, nor can you deny it. The Church of Jesus Christ did without these things for more than three centuries, nor is there a trace of such a kind of life to be found in the Holy Scriptures. Marriage, however, is a Divine ordinance. God will not have man to put asunder those whom he hath joined together. God and nature dictate that children should take care of their parents when they are old; nevertheless, in your opinion, they may break the laws of God and nature, to follow the inventions of men. The husband may forsake his wife, or the daughter her mother, to lead a monastic life. The poor, afflicted mother may crave assistance from her daughter; she may show her white hair, her withered and trembling hands, the bosom on which she was nursed, and, in spite of all that, her daughter may behave like one that is blind and deaf, and betake herself to a cloister. Now, don't you see that the very thought of this, in every heart that is under the fear of God, excites horror, and that it is repugnant to nature, and contrary to his law? Ah, undeceive yourself! The daughter may—nay, she ought, to forsake her mother, if she should ask her to do what is ungodly, if she should command her to do things contrary to the commands of God. Yes, then, but only then, is the daughter obliged to leave her mother, and to refuse her obedience. True it is, and all agree about it, that if the mother disobeys God the daughter ought not to obey her will. But if, on the other hand, the mother permits her daughter to serve Christ in her own house; if she brings her up virtuously; if she exhorts her to the fear of God; if she guides her to salvation, then the mother is as Christian as the abbess, and her house is far more holy than the nunnery. Oh, how many young persons, who are lost in these places, would be saved in their own houses. And although daughters may be saved in the house of a virtuous and pious mother, without going into a cloister, nevertheless, according to your fine rules, they do better to become nuns, in spite of their mothers. Don't you perceive that you transgress the holy law of God by your traditions? You warmly maintain that Peter's daughter, Petronilla, was born before he was called to the apostleship. Pray, how do you know this? Petronilla is a name derived from Peter; and every one knows that the Apostle received this name at the very time when he was chosen to the apostleship; therefore, he had this daughter after he became an Apostle; and as he received the name of Peter so he called his daughter Petronilla. In fact, it is not true that the Apostles forsook their wives entirely, and this is clear in St. Paul—"Have not we power," saith he, "to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?"

Eustachio—You must not suppose that these women were the wives of the Apostles; quite the contrary: they were rich women, who accompanied the Apostles in their journeys, and supplied all their wants.

Salviano—And who can have persuaded you that the holy Apostles, having forsaken their lawful wives, led about with them other women? That would not only have been an inconvenience to them, but a scandal; and the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, would surely have viewed it in a very bad light. Besides which, the Apostles would have little business with such company, in the long journeys that they were obliged to make. Pray, do not deceive yourself. These women could not

have been rich, since St. Paul said that he did not bring a woman with him, that he might not burden the Corinthians. Give yourself the trouble to read the entire chapter, and you will be persuaded of this. What burden could it have been to the Corinthians, if Paul had brought with him a rich lady? It would have been beneficial to them rather than hurtful, if this woman had provided the Apostle with all that he required. You are in error, and your error arises from the transposition of the words. In the Greek text, it is not a woman, a sister, but a sister, a woman (or wife), from which we may see plainly, that the word sister points out the sex of the person, and her religious communion. The word woman would then be superfluous, if it did not denote something further. And what can it denote, if not the bond of marriage? The Apostle, by saying sister, speaks of one who was a woman and a Christian; and by using the word woman, he means one who was united in marriage to one of the Apostles. Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Pope Leo IX. are of this opinion; we may add that which Ecchius relates about St. Peter—"This great hero, seeing his wife led to martyrdom, was much rejoiced, and, calling her by name, said, 'Oh, remember the Lord!'"

(To be continued.)

The foregoing dialogue was sent anonymously, from Italy, to the editor of *L'Echo di Savonarola*, a periodical published in London, in the Italian language. It is now translated and published, in English, with his permission.

THE MORTMAIN QUESTION.

We mentioned in our last number our intention of calling the attention of our readers to the extraordinary influence which many of the Romish doctrines exercise, in pouring wealth into the coffers of the Roman Catholic Church, and the unscrupulous use which is made of that influence by her clergy. We shall select for our first instance the well-known case of *Metairie v. Wiseman*, as one powerfully illustrating, not merely the opportunities which the Romish system opens for undue influence, but as also exhibiting, in a remarkable point of view, the extent to which zeal in the promotion of their objects blinds the eyes of her votaries to the plainest principles of professional honour, and to the most obvious dictates of honesty. The facts of that case, as elicited by the Mortmain Committee of the House of Commons, and published by the order of that House, were as follows:—

"Matharin Carré, a French teacher, had by his profession, and the exercise of all those penurious arts by which avarice accumulates wealth, put together money to the amount of £10,000. This wealth was vested in the public funds, in two specific sums of £7,000 and £3,000. At the close of February, 1847, this old miser, supposed to be about 77 years of age, was taken suddenly ill. A French Roman Catholic doctor, of the name of Gasquet, was sent for; and finding him very ill, told him it was impossible for him to live, and that he had better send for a priest. The old man answered, 'Very well,' but took no more notice of it. No priest was sent for by him. A few days afterwards (it would appear on Sunday, the 28th February) Gasquet again saw him, and observed—"He ought to have port wine and arrowroot; but, poor man, it is impossible he can have them." The landlord, in whose house Carré dwelt, hearing this, said immediately that Carré was very rich, and was able to have anything he liked. On the same day, after morning mass, Gasquet goes to Mr. Holdstock, the priest in direction of the schools of St. Aloysius, at Somerstown, and tells him that there was a man of large fortune dying in a garret, in a neighbouring street, that he would not recover, and that he had better go and see him. Mr. Holdstock lost no time; went to see him the afternoon of that same day, Sunday, and on that occasion took instructions for his will from this old man, whom he had never seen before, and who had not even sent for him. The paper on which those instructions were taken was *lost or mislaid*; but their alleged purport was in conformity with the will subsequently prepared. That same evening Mr. Holdstock sent for Mr. John Athanasius Cooke, a member of the Chancery bar in England. Mr. Cooke had been a convert, and at the time was an attendant at Mr. Holdstock's chapel; and though he had never seen Carré, nor had ever received instructions from him, he at once took upon himself to prepare a will, by which the sum of £7,000 was bequeathed to the Somerstown schools, and the sum of £3,000 was distributed among Carré's relations in France, in the very same proportions in which the statute of distributions would have given it to them, without the intervention of a will at all. And of that will Dr. Griffiths, the Roman Catholic bishop of London district, and Mr. J. A. Cooke, were appointed trustees, and Mr. J. A. Cooke executor.

With this will in his pocket, and accompanied by Mr. Holdstock, Mr. Cooke went to old Carré on the following day (Monday); and during their visit a call at Carré's lodgings was made by two women—one of them Mr. Holdstock's housekeeper, the other a neighbouring schoolmistress. These women (evidently intended to act as wit-

nesses, though entirely unacquainted with Carré) were, however, dismissed on this occasion, as Carré refused to sign the will. It then occurred to Mr. Cooke, as the will was not proceeded with, that there might be an improvement in the management of the matter; and accordingly he suggested the execution of a deed, with a power of attorney, to transfer the £7,000 into the names of Carré, Mr. Cooke, and Dr. Griffiths, the Roman Catholic bishop, and at the same time a will to be made, disposing of the remaining £3,000 amongst the next of kin.

The manifest object of this scheme was not merely to save legacy duty, but to conceal from the relatives altogether the amount of the property, and lead them to suppose that the will was conversant with all that he possessed.

These documents were also prepared by Mr. Cooke; and on the Thursday following Mr. Cooke, accompanied, as before, by Mr. Holdstock, and attended by the schoolmistress and a Mr. Hay, a clerk in the banking-house of the Messrs. Wright, the Roman Catholic bankers, proceeded to old Carré's lodgings. The description of what passed there is certainly striking. On arriving they were told that Mr. Carré was too ill to see them—"Very ill, and did not wish to see them." The priest said he was not to be treated in that manner, and rushed up to the bed-room of the dying man, and shortly afterwards called up the rest. All the witnesses agree in stating that the only words used by Carré were, "You may leave these papers." Mr. Cooke, on hearing this, took his hat, and was about to leave the room. Not so the priest, who desired him to sit still; and then, approaching the old man, spoke something to him in French. Whatever he said, the result was, that the priest, leaning over the "flap of a box" (in which the old miser had for years slept), held him up by the back, put a pen into his hand, and the documents were then executed: by the one conveying away £7,000 of his property to men he had never seen or known before, and by the other making two men, neither of whom he knew, the distributors of the remaining £3,000 among his next of kin. Nor was this all, the deed reserved to old Carré the usual power of appointment over the fund, by deed, in a certain manner; and of course, under such circumstances, the custody of the deed ought to have remained with the party having such power, for otherwise the exercise of the power would, to a great extent, if not entirely, be at the discretion of the person in whose custody the deed was, and this seems to have been the idea of Carré; for having signed the documents, he said to Cooke—"Now you may leave them." Not so, thought Mr. Cooke, and he insisted that the possession of the deed should remain with himself. The reasons and excuses assigned by Mr. Cooke for thus proceeding are certainly most contradictory; and though too long for insertion, we venture to say that the perusal of his evidence on this subject affords one of the most striking instances that has ever come before the public of the extent to which zeal in the service of the Church can pervert the human intellect, and blind its votary to the plainest principle of professional honour and integrity.

The possession of the deed thus secured, the next step to be taken was to effect an immediate transfer into the names of the trustees appointed by the deed. The execution of the deed and will was on Thursday; and on the following morning, Friday, the power of attorney was lodged at the bank. On Saturday, although, as Mr. Cooke says, he "did not know Carré was worse," still, having been at early mass on that morning, "he had a strong feeling on his mind that he ought to transfer the stock that day." Accordingly, he is at the broker's office before the office is open; he pays "an expedition fee" at the bank. The transfer is completed certainly before half-past one o'clock. Returning home in a cab, he calls at poor Carré's house; the landlord runs down stairs, and says—"He is gone, sir." "Gone—do you mean dead?" returns Cooke. "Yes." He then anxiously ascertains that he had died at ten minutes past four. Had his death been sooner, or the transfer been later, the arrangements would have been all defeated. Now, however, Mr. Cooke thought all was right. His duty to the Church was fully discharged, and accordingly he forthwith proceeds to lodge the deed with Dr. Griffiths, his co-trustee, and the Roman Catholic bishop of the London district, who receives it without surprise, and as if already acquainted with its contents.

Such are the leading facts of this extraordinary case, as detailed in the affidavits and examinations in the Court of Chancery, and subsequently given in evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons; and up to the point to which we have now brought our readers it might be said, that this was nothing more than the ordinary case of undue influence exercised over a dying man by an officious priest and a meddling lawyer, and their individual misconduct would afford no legitimate ground of charge against clerical influence. We shall now state the subsequent history of this case, in order to enable our readers to judge whether our charge against the system is well founded. The whole of the above facts were indisputably established, both in the Chancery suit and before the Committee; and consequently brought prominently before the notice of Cardinal